

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Summary of the Office Action

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled. Claim 21 is new.

2. Response to § 102 and § 103 Rejections

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set out below, and ask the Examiner for reconsideration.

SpyGlass Prism: Concepts and Applications (hereinafter “Spyglass”) discusses, very broadly, content conversion between web devices utilizing an intermediary server. Although Spyglass generally describes conversion of content based on conversion rules, it does not describe or disclose using one or more data mining expressions from a data mining conversion language comprising a set of methods operable to identify at least one of the one or more hypertext elements in the hypertext electronic document nor creating a second hypertext electronic document including the extracted hypertext elements on the second network device based on a document template including the data mining conversion variables, wherein the data mining conversion variables are identifiable in the document template by a prefix including “&%” characters. Therefore, the Spyglass document does not anticipate nor render obvious the new independent claim 21.


Adding the teachings of Madnick et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,913,214 (hereinafter, “Madnick”) and Kurz , A., “Data warehousing within intranet: prototype of a web-based executive information system” (hereinafter, “Kurz”), alone or in combination, does not cure the deficiencies of Spyglass. Madnick describes submitting an information/data request via a query converter to disparate data sources, including web pages, the query converter being used to tailor the request to the particular data source. Once received, a data translator matches the data context to that of the requestor, however, Madnick is silent as to how and in what manner the

data context matching occurs. Kurz merely describes extracting raw data from a data warehouse and creating data cubes that may be displayed to a user in a web format, such as HTML. However, neither Madnick nor Kurz, alone or in combination, describe creating a second hypertext electronic document including the extracted hypertext elements on the second network device based on a document template including the data mining conversion variables, wherein the data mining conversion variables are identifiable in the document template by a prefix including "&%" characters. The specification file (See 706 and Table 2 of Madnick) referred to in the Office Action as a "template" is a file used to query a data source and not a template used to create a second hypertext electronic document. Further, the specification file appears to have character suffixes at the end of formatting lines (e.g., See Table 2, A#, etc.) but does not have data mining conversion variables identifiable in the document template by a prefix including "&%" characters, as recited in the present claim and further described in the specification as filed. Consequently, the present claim is not obvious in view of Spyglass in view of Madnick in further view of Kurz, and therefore is patentable over the cited art.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Larry J. Johnson at (408) 947-8200 ext. 208.

Dated: 9-29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Nathan P. Elder
Reg. No. 55,150

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200